

## REMARKS

### Status of Claims

Claims 1, 11, and 12 are pending. Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 1 is amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found at least in paragraphs 93 through 98 and Figures 48 and 49. Claims 2-10, 13, and 14 have been cancelled in previous correspondence with the Office. Claims 1, 11, and 12 remain for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. No new matter has been added.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,492,219 to Stupar. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the instant rejection.

Stupar is directed to a package 20' that includes a first sheet of film material 26', a second sheet of film material 28', and a third or intermediate sheet of film material 30', all sheets being joined together so as to form separated compartments. The third sheet of film material 30' extends the entire length of the package 20' and is heat-sealed or bonded at its midpoint to the midpoint location 68' of the first sheet of film material 26' so as to define the heat-sealed bonded region 67'. The second sheet of film material 28' and the third sheet of film material 30' define a larger compartment 34'. The third sheet of film material 30' also serves to define, along with a half-portion of the first sheet of film material 26', a smaller second compartment 32' for housing or containing polyamine material 22'. The third sheet of film material 30', along with the remaining half-portion of the first sheet of film material 26', further defines a third separated compartment 98. The half-portion of the first sheet of film material 26' defining the smaller second compartment 32' does not form the third separated compartment 98, and the half-portion of the first sheet of film material 26' defining the third separated compartment 98 does not form the smaller second compartment 32'. The third separated compartment 98 is substantially the same size as second compartment 32' and remains vacant. (Stupar, col. 10, line 47 to col. 11, line 54 and FIG. 5.)

Stupar fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a multi-chamber container that accommodates a plurality of agents, comprising, *inter alia*, an outer container body formed

by at least one flexible sheet of material, the outer container body comprising a cavity, and an inner container body disposed in the cavity of the outer body, the inner container body including a plurality of filling chambers to fill agents, as is recited in claim 1. In contrast, the package of Stupar is three compartments (larger compartment 34', second compartment 32', and third separated compartment) such that two of the compartments are defined by the same wall, i.e. the first sheet of film material 26'. In such a configuration, three separate sheets of film are arranged such that the third sheet of film is interposed between the first and second sheets of film. As such, the second compartment 32' and the third separated compartment 98 of Stupar are not disposed in a cavity of an outer body, but are simply located alongside of the larger compartment 34'. A multi-chamber container that accommodates a plurality of agents, comprising, *inter alia*, an outer container body formed by at least one flexible sheet of material, the outer container body comprising a cavity, and an inner container body disposed in the cavity of the outer body, the inner container body including a plurality of filling chambers to fill agents, as recited in claim 1, is not a package in which second and third compartments are located alongside one larger compartment, as in Stupar. Accordingly, the multi-chamber container as recited in claim 1 is patentably distinct from the package of Stupar.

Because Stupar fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the multi-chamber container as recited in claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by the Stupar reference. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stupar as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0188281 to Iwasa et al.

Claims that depend from a claim that is non-obvious are themselves necessarily non-obvious. Because claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1, and because claim 1 is non-obvious, claims 11 and 12 are likewise necessarily non-obvious. Applicants, therefore, submit that claims 11 and 12 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 11 and 12.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein are allowable. An early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Applicants believe that no fees are due with the submission of this Amendment. If any charges are incurred with respect to this Amendment, they may be charged to Deposit Account No. 503342 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Richard R. Michaud/  
Richard R. Michaud  
Registration No. 40,088  
Attorney for Applicant

Michaud-Kinney Group LLP  
306 Industrial Park Road, Suite 206  
Middletown, CT 06457-1532  
Tel: (860) 632-7200  
Fax: (860) 632-8269